

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/900,280	07/06/2001	Gang Luo	(9917) NCRC-0051-US	6088	
26890 7	7590 04/07/2004		EXAMINER		
JAMES M. STOVER			FLEURANTIN, JEAN B		
NCR CORPOR	RATION PATTERSON BLVD, W	/HO4	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
DAYTON, OI			2172		
			DATE MAILED: 04/07/2004	1	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

2.7	Application No.	Applicant(s)	4
Advisory Action	09/900,280	LUO ET AL.	
,	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jean B Fleurantin	2172	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 29 March 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to ave final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment whic I (with appeal fee); or (3) a timel	ation. A proper reply to a h places the application i	a in
	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin is FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See M R 1.136(a) and the appropriate bunt of the fee. The appropriate originally set in the final Office	MPEP e extension e extension action; or
timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	CFR 1.704(b).		
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF 			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
 (c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or 	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplify	ing the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.	
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed amer	ndment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT pla	ce the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were nev	vly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			ın
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: 4,7,8,16-19,33 and 43-50.			
Claim(s) objected to: 41 and 42.			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3,13-15,24-32 and 34-40</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		١.	
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approximately approximatel	roved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.	1
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer 10. Other:	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	ALFORD KINDRED	
		PRIMARY EXAMINE	

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants stated on pages 12 and 13 that no teaching "storing ... base relations; and storing ... one of the base relations." It is respectively submitted Mumick suggests materialized views includes one or more materialized views ... like a table, (see Mumick col. 3, lines 29-39).

In response to applicants' argument on page 13, that "Mumick and Colby ...every element of the claim. A prima facie case ...established with respect to claim 1." A prima facie case of obvious of is established when the teachings from the prior art itself would appear to have suggested the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art. Once such a case is established, it is incumbent upon appellant to go forward with objective evidence of unobviousness. In re Fielder, 471 F.2d 640, 176 USPQ 300 (CCPA 1973). Furthermore, see Mumick col. 3, lines 20-39; and Colby figure 1, page 408, col. 2, lines 25-30. Therefore, the last Office Action is maintained.